

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/086,025 | 02/28/2002 | Marc R. Anderson | 286697-00005 | 7853 |
| 7: | 590 05/04/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP | | | SODERQUIST, ARLEN | |
| 1762 Technology Drive Suite 226 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| San Jose, CA 95110 | | | 1743 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/086,025 | ANDERSON ET AL. | , |
| Advisory Addidit | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Arlen Soderquist | 1743 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a | ppears on the cover sheet wit | h the correspondence addre | ess |
| THE REPLY FILED 20 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required trinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114 | o avoid abandonment of this : (1) a timely filed amendmen peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a | application. A proper reply to the application of t | to a on in |
| PERIOD FOR | REPLY [check either a) or b |)] | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the m b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of t no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exponents of the control of the major of | this Advisory Action, or (2) the date spire later than SIX MONTHS from the WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH: The date on which the petition under iod of extension and the corresponding of the shortened statutory period for Office later than three months after | e mailing date of the final rejection S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. S or 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the approping amount of the fee. The approper reply originally set in the final O | n. see MPEP priate extension priate extension ffice action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entere | , ,, | | |
| (a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require fu | | arch (see NOTE below): | |
| (b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see No | | | |
| (c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or | • | y materially reducing or simp | olifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without can | celing a corresponding numb | er of finally rejected claims. | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | • • | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re | ejection(s): | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | . , | in a separate, timely filed a | mendment |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because: | | considered but does NOT | place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | because it is not directed SOI | LELY to issues which were | newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims | | | d an |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow | ws: | · | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-109. | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a | approved or b) disapprove | ed by the Examiner. | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State | ment(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N | o(s) | - |
| 10. Other: | arlen Se | odergust | |
| | | ν | |

ARLEN SOCERQUIST PRIMARY EXAMINER

10. Other: _

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the changes to the specification raise the issue of new matter in that they cancel reference to applications and patents, thus changing the scope of the disclosure and ultimately the claims. Additionally the claims have changed to scope that appears to be different from those examined.